

REMARKS

Claims 2-6 and 13-14 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7-12 have been withdrawn. Claims 2 and 3 are currently amended. Claims 13 and 14 have been added as new. Basis for these amendments can be found on page 25, lines 8-25 and page 27, lines 13-16 of the specification, respectively. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

PRIORITY

The Applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 2000-219513 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Pursuant to a conversation with the Examiner on December 13, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the certified copy has been received from the International Bureau and Applicants confirm that all requirements regarding the priority document have been met. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

The Abstract stands objected to because it does not pertain to the elected species. Applicant(s) have amended the Abstract accordingly. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 3 to recite “an enlargement ratio” and therefore render this rejection moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,580,373). Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Fujinami et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,359). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 2

According to the claimed invention, a synthesized image in which an enlargement ratio is relatively higher in a nearby area of the vehicle than in a peripheral area of the vehicle is displayed. Furthermore, the synthesized image includes ground portions of both front and rear tires of left or right side of the vehicle. By these features, the user can confirm both the close-up state in the nearby area and the state in the wide peripheral area.

In contrast, Ohashi discloses an enlarged image around the tire (Fig.16). However, in Ohashi, the image around the tire is equally enlarged. Ohashi also fails to disclose

image synthesis process which makes an enlargement ratio relatively higher in the nearby area than in the peripheral area.

In Fujinami, the nearby area of the vehicle is optically enlarged and captured using a prism placed in front of the camera. The image synthesis of the claimed invention is not performed.

The synthesized image of the claimed invention (see Figs. 8A and 8B) shows a wide area around the side of the vehicle. This point is different from Fig.16 in Ohashi and Fig. 4 in Fujinami. For example, in Fig.16 in Ohashi, the user can merely confirm the area near the ground portion of the tire and cannot confirm the other tire and the wide area around the side of the vehicle concurrently.

New Claims 13 and 14

According to the claimed inventions, in the image synthesis process, the camera image is projected onto a bowl model and by viewing the projected camera image from a virtual viewpoint, the synthesized image is generated. Using such an image synthesis, an enlargement ratio becomes relatively higher in a nearby area than in a peripheral area in the synthesized image.

In addition, when the virtual viewpoint is set above the camera to be downward, the side surface of the body becomes linear in the synthesized image. The user can easily grasp how close the vehicle is to the road edge by merely viewing such a synthesized image.

Ohashi and Fujinami fail to teach or suggest the features of Claims 13 and 14.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 5077-000092/US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory A. Stobbs

Registration No.: 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. Box 828

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

(248) 641-1214

Attorney for Applicant